"My name is Christian, my surname is Catholic." – St. Pacian

INTERDVM

"Increase our faith." – Luke 17:5

A journal published now and then by Patrick Henry Omlor

Box R, Menlo Park, Calif. 94025 May 2, 1970 Issue No. 3

RES SACRAMENTI

I. INTRODUCTION

Changing a Single Word

In the year 867, the "Filioque" controversy was touched off by Photius, who ultimately led the Byzantine Church into schism. Denying that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, Photius accused the Latins of having corrupted the Creed by adding this word: filioque (and the Son). This dispute served as a theological wedge (at least it was the ostensible reason, but political motivations likewise entered the picture), a wedge which pried open the Great Eastern Schism, that horrendous rupture which still remains today after eleven hundred years.

This should make one ponder the importance words can have, yes, even a single word. Moreover we need only reflect that it is by means of words, and solely through words, that we are able to come to know our faith, and to express it. As St. Paul puts it: "Faith comes through hearing."[1] Why has the Church always guarded so very jealously the words and formulas committed to Her custodianship by Her Divine Master? Precisely because She knows that it is always through words--the misuse of them--that heresy is able to take its toll of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Thus it is truly foreboding that the subversives -- the enemy is not "at the gates," but rather inside tending the gates -- should brazenly lay their hands on the form of a sacrament, should attempt to change the very words Christ Himself, the Son of God, used in instituting the Most Holy Eucharist, and this heinous crime is committed with impunity. But even more ominous is the fact that so few priests even seem to be aware of the change, or if aware are the least bit concerned about it. The false rendering of the word multis ("many") as "all men," a mutilation of the very Consecration Form, is by no means an inconsequential affair, for the change in meaning conveyed is laden with the most serious implications, from the standpoint of sacramental theology. At no time since the Filioque controversy began has so much spiritual danger been capsulated into a single word as is now the case with "multis."

Rev. James A. McInerney, O. P., writing in The Wanderer,[2] indicates his disbelief "that a single word change in the English translation" can possibly invalidate the Mass. Obviously, however, in sacramental forms it is not the quantity of words altered that matters, but rather the significance of the change that is made. Is it possible to baptize with these words: "I anoint thee in the name of the Father...etc."? This is a "single word change." Most moral theologians, the Doctor St. Alphonsus Liguori[3] included, teach that if a priest were to say over the bread: "HIC est enim corpus meum" (meaning "Here is My Body"), instead of "HOC est..." ("This is..."), then the consecration would be invalid. And this involves the absolutely minimal change of only one letter in a word!

Why This Battleground?

Knowing word manipulation to be one of their most potent weapons, the enemies of Holy Mother Church are always seeking to improve their techniques of semantic warfare. Present examples of such word manipulation are so numerous that it would be difficult even to begin cataloguing all of them. At this point the Satanic warfare against the Mystical Body has reached such proportions, is so advanced, so global, so permeating through every facet of doctrine, morals and discipline, that, if viewed from a purely human perspective, it would have to be granted that our enemies have already won. But we know that the Church is not merely a human institution; She was built by Divine Hands and She is indefectible; She is indestructible and cannot be overthrown by men, nor by powers and principalities.

However, this certain knowledge on our part of Her ultimate victory over the Powers of The Beast does not exempt us from the obligation of fighting. On the contrary, we are members of the Church Militant, and our very salvation depends upon how valiantly we fight. How well we all know that we by ourselves cannot emerge victorious from any battle, not even a skirmish--Satan can sift us as wheat--, but she who is Our Queen is now clad in her armor, "terrible as an army set in battle array"; she alone is the Vanquisher of All Heresies, but even so, she does expect her bungling troops at least to be there under her banner.

Just as the Church in an earlier era defended at a terrible price the one word, filioque; and, though foreseeing the schism that resulted, She refused to yield an iota of doctrine, so now we likewise throw down the gauntlet before the enemies of "the Faith of our Fathers"

on this single word: multis.

On this word the stakes are very high indeed since the destruction of its true meaning (in the Form of Consecration) has at least jeopardized the validity of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. But even if there were no question here about the validity of the "English Mass," this change is still an evil thing; it is a wanton tampering with the Sacred Words of Christ Himself; it is a serious attack on the immemorial liturgical tradition of all the Rites of the Church; it is contrary to the express prohibitions of the Magisterium regarding the touching of the substance of the sacraments; this change was introduced sub rosa for demonstrably fraudulent "reasons"; the motivations and impetus behind this innovation are questionable, for it has subtle heretical implications; in short: it has been the tool par excellence for the overthrow in one fell swoop of just about everything that we as Catholics, our souls bearing the indelible mark of the Sacrament of Confirmation, are morally bound to defend. We cannot and will not tolerate it. "But though ...an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."[4]

But what do we hope to accomplish? Let us, above all, be realistic. At this point our most pressing task is to try to help divert as many as possible of our fellow-members of The Mystical Body of Christ away from this total, universal apostasy. The present apostatical movement is to the religion of humanity, and its ultimate destination is the worship of Antichrist. The only thing that effectively saves souls is the grace of God, but it is our duty to take all measures, spiritual and practical, to aid others in seeing what they must do in order to cooperate with that sufficient grace.

In this present maelstrom of heresy, perversion and apostasy, there has perhaps been no issue that has served more powerfully than this "for all men" controversy to make good, though hitherto apathetic, Catholics become aware of the terrible nature of the warfare we are all engaged in. The issue itself and exactly what is at stake are relatively easy to understand; except for those who are wilfully blind. The defenses of the subverters on this particular question, moreover, are so weak and their arguments and "reasons" so superficial, even manifestly absurd, that this alone has made not a few Catholics of good will realize that there is something radically and ominously wrong. Heartening it is that quite a few (relatively speaking, of course) courageous priests, once realizing the frightful magnitude of what has happened and is happening, have refused outright to use these doubtful "English Canons" with the palpable mutilation: "for all men." Almighty God has blessed them with the fortitude to say with that most valiant warrior for Christ, that model priest: "If the whole world goes Arian, then it is Athanasius against the world!"

The Scope of This Article

A Dominican priest who is a friend and collaborator of ours wrote the following to another Dominican theologian: "The arguments against Patrick Omlor's and Fr. Brey's position seem to be these: 1) The additional words of the form are not essential (i.e., the words in the wine consecration following: 'This is the chalice of My Blood'); 2) The words for all men do not really change the meaning; 3) The Church cannot err in a matter so important. These amount to quarreling in turn with both premises involved in the argument, then resorting to the extrinsic consideration of authority as a last refuge. The few with whom I have debated the question have invariably gone from one to the other of the three defences for their position, which in itself seems to betray the insecurity of their stand."

"Regarding the second point," he continues, "this of course is the dominant point of Patrick Omlor's position, namely that the change from pro multis to pro omnibus is indeed a change in the meaning of the form, which would almost seem self-evident. ... Anyway, I think Omlor ... (shows), in accord with St. Thomas' principles, that what is involved in the difference between the two phrases is the designation of the res sacramenti. And the proof from Leo XIII which he gives for this -- the necessity of sacramental forms to include the grace of the sacrament -- I find air-tight."

It is imperative to comprehend thoroughly this pivotal concept of res sacramenti and also the definitive teaching of Pope Leo XIII, mentioned in the excerpt just quoted. Therefore we devote this issue of Interdum to an explanation of these topics. Whether or not our "proof" is "air-tight" the reader will be able to judge for himself.

II. SACRAMENTAL SIGNIFICATION IN GENERAL

Four Things Necessary for a Sacrament

Because the validity of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is completely dependent upon the valid effecting of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, it behooves one to understand well the nature of sacramental signification in general, and the sacramental signification in the Holy Eucharist in particular; that is, if one is to grasp at all our reasons for seriously questioning the validity of the "English Masses." In that the Words of Consecration in the Mass are also the form of the sacrament of the Eucharist, it is evident that a substantial "defect of form" of the Sacrament invalidates ipso facto Masses employing this "form."

Four things are necessary for the validity of any sacrament: (1) the proper matter must be used; (2) the proper form must be recited; (3) the proper minister (for the given sacrament) must perform the rite; (4) the minister must have the intention of "doing as the Church does," that is, doing what the Church intends and wishes to accomplish by the sacrament.

Importance of the Form

The matter is the specific sensible thing or things used in the external rite of the sacrament; for example, water in Baptism, or chrism in Confirmation. The form is the sequence of specific words (the "formula") pro-

nounced by the minister. It must be "morally united" with the matter; that is, the words must be recited in conjunction with the use of the matter and in the same setting or presence of the matter. "The word," says St. Augustine, "is added to the element (matter), and this becomes a sacrament." [5]

Although all four of the aforementioned requirements are absolutely essential for validity, and if any one of them is absent or defective there is no sacrament at all, our discussion at present concerns the vital role of the form.

St. Thomas explains why the necessity of a specific sequence of words as the form of a sacrament is more important even than specific matter: "As stated above, in the sacraments the words are as the form, and sensible things are as the matter. Now in all things composed of matter and form, the determining principle is contained in the form. ...Consequently, for the being of a thing the need of a determinate form is prior to the need of determinate matter... Since, therefore, in the sacraments determinate sensible things are required which are as the sacramental matter, much more is there need in them of a determinate form of words." [6]

The Determining Principle

What does this mean: "the determining principle is contained in the form"? This means that the words recited determine the end or purpose for which the matter is being used. Water in itself, for example, signifies nothing in particular. It can be used for drinking, bathing, putting out fires, watering the lawn, washing clothes, etc. But when a person says the words, "I baptize thee...etc.," as he pours water over the head of another person, the purpose for which that particular water is being used is clearly denoted. Thus the words, "I baptize thee," constitute the principle which determines unambiguously that this water is here being used to signify the cleansing from sin and the bringing to the state of justification.

Suppose I am out in the garage and suddenly shout, "Quick! Bring water!" This order contains no determining principle whatsoever, and therefore my wife (who is inside the house), though she has heard me, hasn't the slightest idea why I want water. A glass of water to quench my thirst? A basin of water to wash my hands? Or the garden hose to put out a fire?

A determining principle denotes purpose. And thus we should clearly understand the explanation of St. Thomas that in the sacraments the need of a specific form of words is more essential than specific matter, for "the determining principle is contained in the form."

The "Res Sacramenti"

Each of the seven sacraments has special effects for the soul of the recipient, and these effects, different for each sacrament, are in keeping with the purpose for which Christ instituted each sacrament. A variety of terms are used by theologians and spiritual writers to designate the "special effects" of a sacrament, but these terms all amount to the same thing. Hence we find these "special effects" referred to as: the sacramental grace, the crowning effect, the power or virtue of the sacrament, the grace proper, etc. Theologians often use the term, "res sacramenti" to denote the special effect of a sacrament, and this is generally translated as "the reality of the sacrament."

This special effect, the "res sacramenti," for each particular sacrament always must be signified or symbolized in the external rite of the sacrament. This point is very important, and we will be mentioning it again. The Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII laid down the following teaching, a fundamental principle of sacramental theology: "All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite -- that is to say, in the matter and form -- it still pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form." [7] And so, these basic premises should be borne in mind throughout the ensuing discussion: A sacrament must signify the grace which it effects; and this "res sacramenti" must be symbolized in both the matter and the form; and this signification, to employ the words of Pope Leo XIII, "pertains chiefly to the form." [8]

The Res Sacramenti of Baptism

The res sacramenti of Baptism, its crowning effect, is, to use the words of St. Thomas, "inward justification." [9] Or, in other words, the remission of original sin and, in the case of adults being baptized, actual sin also. Let us now see how this res sacramenti is signified in both the matter and the form of Baptism. First of all the matter, which is water, is a substance that is often used as a cleansing agent, and thus the cleansing from sin, "inward justification," is thereby symbolized. It is to be noted, in accordance with the earlier explanation, that water does not necessarily signify cleansing, but the words of the form, the determining principle, give the baptismal water this signification. We know a priori that the res sacramenti is necessarily signified in the form, and it is easily seen that it is denoted by the following words: "I baptize thee," inasmuch as the word baptize means, as St. Thomas remarks, "to cleanse." [10]

Although the words, "I baptize thee," alone by themselves, signify the res sacramenti, it must not be thought that the remainder of the form, namely, "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," is unnecessary for the validity of the sacrament of Baptism. The res sacramenti is not necessarily the only thing a sacramental rite must signify, as the following example of Confirmation will show. Considering Baptism, then, we have studied a lucid example of how the res sacramenti is signified in: (a) the matter of the

sacrament, and (b) the form of the sacrament, thus illustrating and harmonizing with the principle of Pope Leo XIII cited earlier.

The Res Sacramenti of Confirmation

Confirmation is the sacrament for those who have come of age or matured as Catholics. As St. Thomas remarks, "Confirmation is to Baptism as growth to birth."[11] In another of his articles the Angelic Doctor says: "For in Baptism he receives power to do those things which pertain to his own salvation, forasmuch as he lives to himself : whereas in Confirmation he receives power to do those things which pertain to the spiritual combat with the enemies of the Faith."[12] And in still another place he says, "In this sacrament the fulness of the Holy Ghost is given for the spiritual strength which belongs to the perfect age."[13] Confirmation, then, we may define as "the sacrament by which we receive the Holy Ghost and His gifts, making us fully grown in the supernatural life. By this sacrament we become soldiers of Jesus Christ and defenders of the Mystical Body."[14]

The matter of Confirmation is chrism, which is a mixture of olive oil and balm (balsam). The form is: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The very word confirmation implies that there is already something there to be confirmed or strengthened. We now ask the crucial question: what is the res sacramenti, that special grace of the sacrament of Confirmation? It is the bestowal of the Holy Ghost and His gifts for spiritual strength in the combat.

According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent,[15] there are three things signified in this sacrament: (1) "the divine power, which, as a principal cause, operates in the sacrament," and this is "sufficiently declared by the concluding words of the form: 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"

(2) "the strength of mind and soul which is imparted by the sacred unction to the faithful unto salvation," and this is the res sacramenti. This is signified in the form "by the words immediately preceding them (i.e., those words given in (1) above--Ed.): 'I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation.'" Finally, a third thing is signified, and we continue to quote the Roman Catechism:

(3) "and next, the sign impressed on him who is to engage in the warfare of Christ." And this is denoted, "the third, by the words with which the form opens: 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross.'"

From the above it is seen that, in addition to two other things, the res sacramenti is, as it indeed must be, signified in the form of the Sacrament. What remains (although less important to our discussion) is to see how the res sacramenti is symbolized in the matter of the sacrament.

It is fitting that the matter of Confirmation, namely chrism, should be a compound substance; that is, a mixture of substances. "But this sacrament is given," says the Angelic Doctor, "that we may receive the fulness of the Holy Ghost, Whose operations are manifold, according to Wisd. vii. 22, In her is the Holy Spirit,...one, manifold; and I Cor. xii. 4, There are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit. Consequently a compound matter is appropriate to this sacrament."[16]

The one component, olive oil, signifies strength; it makes muscles flexible and also helps to heal bruises and wounds received in battle. Oil also "by its nature unctuous and fluid, expresses the plenitude of grace, which, through the Holy Ghost, overflows and is poured into others from Christ the head..."[17] Or again, to quote St. Thomas: "Now the grace of the Holy Ghost is signified by oil; hence Christ is said to be anointed with the oil of gladness (Ps. xliv. 8)..."[18]

The other component, balm, is particularly noted for its soothing and healing power, and for its aroma. Therefore by being anointed with balm we are made conspicuous in our role as soldiers of Christ, and "diffuse around such a sweet odor of all virtues ... Balsam has, also, the efficacy of preserving from putrescence whatever is anointed with it, a property that seems admirably to express the virtue of this sacrament; whereas it is quite evident that the souls of the faithful, prepared by the heavenly grace imparted in Confirmation, may be easily protected from the contagion of sins."[19]

The anointing with chrism is on the forehead and in the form of a cross, because the soldier must be signed with the standard of his leader, and in the most conspicuous part of his body. "Now, the forehead," comments St. Thomas, "which is hardly ever covered, is the most conspicuous part of the human body. Wherefore the confirmed is anointed with chrism on the forehead, that he may show publicly that he is a Christian : thus too the apostles after receiving the Holy Ghost showed themselves in public, whereas before they remained hidden in the upper room."[20]

The matter of chrism, to reiterate the same point, does not necessarily signify the res sacramenti of Confirmation, the bestowal of the Holy Ghost for spiritual strength in the combat. But the determining principle contained in the words, "I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation," serves to denote the end of purpose for which the sacramental chrism is being used.

Summary of This Section

It is very clear why we define a sacrament as an outward sign (something that signifies) of the invisible grace, res sacramenti, which Christ has given it the power to convey to the soul. Likewise clear is the doctrine of faith taught in our catechism: A sacrament is an outward sign instituted by Christ to produce grace.

The beautifully simple definition of St. Augustine is easily grasped: "The word is added to the element, and this becomes a sacrament." Finally, and this is essential for a grasp of the remainder of our discussion, it should now be evident what the Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII meant when he laid down the basic truth that the whole external rite -- the matter and the form, but chiefly the form -- must signify the special grace of the sacrament, the res sacramenti. Baptism and Confirmation were examined, with this principle in mind, in order to make it easier to see how the same theological rule holds regarding the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

III. SIGNIFICATION IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

The Matter and Form

The matter of the Holy Eucharist is twofold; namely, bread and wine. The words which are the form of this Sacrament are:

FOR THIS IS MY BODY. FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.

Like the matter this form is twofold, but it pertains to the one integral Sacrament. The first sentence is pronounced over the bread, and the second over the wine. This form, as just stated, was defined by the Council of Florence, and it is given in an identical manner in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and in the instruction De Defectibus which accompanies the Roman Missal.

An Objection

Some have claimed that the words, "This is the chalice of My Blood," and these words taken alone by themselves, are sufficient for the valid consecration of the wine. And thus they deny the necessity of the entire form stated above, alleging that a mere part of the second sentence suffices for the wine consecration. Many great theologians, including St. Thomas in all of his writings where he discusses this subject --not just in the Summa-- have, on the contrary, claimed the necessity of the entire second formula up to and including the words: "for many unto the remission of sins." Here, for example, is one clear passage of St. Thomas: "In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are NECESSARY for the form, but the words This is the chalice of My Blood only, not the remainder which follows. ... But this does not seem suitable; for all which follows is a determination of the predicate : HENCE IT ALL PERTAINS TO THE MEANING OR SIGNIFICATION of the same statement. And because, as has often been said, IT IS BY SIGNIFYING THAT THE FORMS OF SACRAMENTS HAVE THEIR EFFECT, THE WHOLE (sentence) BELONGS TO THE EFFECTING POWER OF THE FORM."[21]

All the earlier Thomists, unanimously, up to Cajetan's time held this selfsame opinion.[22] Cajetan,[23] however, in his commentaries on the Summa, expressed an opinion (contradicting St. Thomas) that the truncated "form", This is the chalice of My Blood, is sufficient for the validity of the wine consecration. But the Sovereign Pontiff St. Pius V, when he ordered Cajetan's commentaries to be published, also explicitly commanded that THIS PARTICULAR OPINION BE EXPURGATED!

The Res Sacramenti of The Holy Eucharist

To attempt to show that the entire form is necessary is not our present purpose (the arguments along these lines of the great theologians cannot be improved upon); but we wish to express our opinion why we are convinced that the words of the final clause, namely, "which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins," are necessary for the validity of the Holy Eucharist and, perforce, the validity of the Mass. Particularly are we interested in demonstrating the vital signification contained in the words: "for you and for many (pro multis)."

The reader, undoubtedly, is anticipating that we will now ask the key question: What is the res sacramenti of the Holy Eucharist? The special grace proper to this Sacrament, "the res sacramenti is the unity of the Mystical Body, outside which there can be no salvation," are the words of the Angelic Doctor.[24] In many laymen's missals is printed the prayer of St. Thomas, which is recommended for recitation before receiving Holy Communion, and which contains the following: "Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may receive not only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord, but also the whole grace ('rem') and virtue of the Sacrament." In emphasizing what constitutes the res sacramenti, this same prayer of St. Thomas continues, "...that I may be found worthy to be incorporated with His Mystical Body and numbered among His members."

In a chapter entitled, "The Reason for the Institution of This Most Holy Sacrament," the Sacred Council of Trent ratified this teaching of St. Thomas: "He (Christ) wished it (the Eucharist) furthermore to be a pledge of our future glory and everlasting happiness, and THUS BE A SYMBOL OF THAT ONE BODY OF WHICH HE IS THE HEAD and to which He wished us to be united as members by the closest bond of faith, hope and charity..."[25]

Just what does this mean: that the res sacramenti of the Holy Eucharist is the "unity (or union) of the Mystical Body? Simply this: that the person who receives this Sacrament worthily becomes incorporated, or more strongly incorporated, into the Mystical Body; and thus the bond of his union with Christ, the Head, is solidified and strengthened, and also the close bond of spiritual union that exists between him and every one of the MANY who are his fellow-members of the Mystical Body.

Res Sacramenti Symbolized in the Matter

In the matter of the bread and wine the unity of the Mystical Body is clearly symbolized (as one must expect), and some of the earliest Fathers, including St. Augustine, pointed this out. Let us, however, quote St. Thomas: "... the effect (of the Eucharist) with regard to the whole Church, which is made up of MANY believers, just as the bread is composed of MANY

grains and the wine flows from MANY grapes, as the gloss observes on I Cor. x,17: We, being MANY...are one body,etc." [26] (In this passage of Aquinas we have capitalized the word MANY, which word appears four times.)

And so, it is easily verified that the res sacramenti, the unity of the Mystical Body, is very clearly signified in the matter of this Sacrament.

How Can "This Is...My Blood" Suffice?

Adhering to the certain teaching of the Supreme Authority Leo XIII that the special grace of every sacrament must be signified in the external rite of the sacrament--matter and form, but chiefly in the form--, we now pose a question for those who claim that the words, This is My Body. This is the chalice of My Blood, are all the words required as the valid form of the Holy Eucharist. How can they show that these words, alone by themselves, signify the res sacramenti which is the unity of Christ's Mystical Body? These words denote transubstantiation, and they refer ONLY to Christ's True CORPOREAL Body, not to His MYSTICAL Body. If anyone would claim that these words do signify Christ's Mystical Body, he would thereby in effect be denying transubstantiation and Christ's Real Presence! --or rather, and this is worse perhaps, affirming our own transubstantiation!

Moreover, it cannot be argued that these words, This is My Body. This is...My Blood, somehow signify both Christ's true corporeal Body and also His Mystical Body -- an absurd conjecture to begin with, for how then would the many members of the Mystical Body enter the picture? --, because a sacramental form cannot be ambiguous, i.e., having two meanings. "The essential part must contain within itself all that is essential to the due conveyance of the grace or power attached to the Sacrament. ... The essential part must 1) signify the grace or power to be conveyed; for, as the Bull tells us, 'it is the nature of a Sacrament to signify what it effects, and to effect what it signifies.' Moreover, THE SIGNIFICATION MUST NOT BE AMBIGUOUS, but 2) so far definite as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind; as, for instance, the graces of other Sacraments." [27]

The lengthy quotation just cited is from the "Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'". Authored by the Catholic Hierarchy of England, in answer to the Anglican Hierarchy's attack on this Bull (wherein Pope Leo XIII declared Anglican Orders invalid and wherein he taught this principle we have been frequently mentioning), this "Vindication" is, needless to say, the most authoritative interpretation of the Bull.

In any case, as for those who claim the abbreviated "form", This is the chalice of My Blood, is sufficient for the wine consecration, we would be interested in seeing how they will attempt to reconcile this opinion with the teaching of Pope Leo XIII that the res sacramenti must be signified in the form of the sacrament.

***

Presenting Our Opinion

It would seem that there are four things that are signified in this Sacrament: 1) transubstantiation; 2) sacrifice; 3) propitiation; 4) the res sacramenti : the unity of Christ's Mystical Body.

Transubstantiation, the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, is denoted by the words: This is My Body. This is the chalice of My Blood. Although these words denote the transubstantiation, the change of the wine into Christ's Blood (and also His Body, soul and divinity) does not actually take place until the entire form is completed.

Had Christ so willed it, He could have left us the Sacrament of His Body and Blood completely apart from Calvary, simply by giving his priests the power of transubstantiating. But He actually willed the Holy Eucharist to be given to us in the context of Sacrifice. The Holy Eucharist is Sacrament and Sacrifice. The words given above (which denote transubstantiation) do not in themselves denote sacrifice. Therefore these words of the form, "which shall be shed," fulfill the purpose of signifying the shedding of Christ's Blood; i.e., sacrifice. [28]

The sacrifices of the Old Law were not true sacrifices of propitiation; they did not actually have the power of expiating sins; for the blood of animals is powerless in this regard. Christ's Passion and Death, the Atonement of the Son of God, was truly propitiatory (expiatory) for the remission of sins. This propitiatory aspect of Calvary is denoted by these words of the form, "of the NEW and eternal testament," and also by the final words of the form, "unto the remission of sins."

Of course, this was the effect of Calvary, but it is not the principal effect of the Holy Eucharist. "If anyone says that the principal fruit of the most Holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result from it, let him be anathema." [29]

And this leads us to the fourth thing that must be signified in this Sacrament : the unity of the Mystical Body. It is our belief that this vital signification is found in the words of the form: "for you and for MANY." For these words denote the purpose or end of Our Lord's institution of the Sacrament. Therefore these words comprise a key part of the determining principle in the form. Just as the words, "I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation," denote the purpose or end for which the sacramental chrism is being used; just as the words "I baptize thee" denote the purpose for which the water is being used in Baptism; so also -- and this is the crux of it -- the words, "for you and for many," designate the purpose or end for which the matter, the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, was intended by Christ to be used. And this purpose is to establish the unity of the many members of the Mystical Body. This sacramental aspect of the Holy Eucharist has nothing to do with the other doctrine of faith that "Christ died for all men." [30]

The Pons Asinorum

Some priests, we are sure, have refused to give our presentation a hearing simply because they have it in their minds that the beginning words, "This is the chalice of My Blood," are sufficient for the validity of the wine consecration. They have heard and read this opinion in textbooks and have adopted it as their own.

What they fail to realize is that all the truly great theologians who held this opinion, St. Bonaventure for example, expressed it as their opinion long before the teaching of Pope Leo XIII, that the form must signify the res sacramenti. Even after this pronouncement, many writers of theological manuals have simply gone on repeating the same opinion (of the sufficiency of the abbreviated "form"), quoting the same earlier authorities, etc., seemingly without realizing the impact of Pope Leo's principle on this opinion.

The fact that St. Bonaventure, or even St. Alphonsus[31] (who leaned towards this opinion and called it "probable"), did not take into consideration the necessity of the res sacramenti being expressed in the form, noway detracts from them. In the centuries that have elapsed since the first Pentecost Sunday, all of Catholic theology has developed. What we mean is that the understanding and the codification of theology by men has developed (i.e., the arguments for the truths of faith, their reasonableness, etc.); this, of course, is entirely different from the Modernists' heresy of the "evolution of doctrine." Periodically the Holy Ghost inspires Peter to lay down theological principles with absolute certainty. Often these pronouncements from the Supreme Teaching Authority are to stem a current heresy, and sometimes, through God's infinite wisdom and omniscience, they are to provide a defense against future attacks on Holy Church.

The following example will add light to this point. Most Catholics are probably not aware that the first person known to have catalogued the Sacraments as seven in number (circa 1150) was Peter Lombard.[32] Looking back now, this was at a point farther along than halfway thru the present lifetime of the Church. Though Peter Lombard expressed this as an opinion, subsequently the Church declared: "If anyone shall say that there are more or less than seven ... (sacraments), let him be anathema."[33]

IV. THE DENIAL OF THE MYSTICAL BODY

The "Form" in English

Here is the ICEL form: "this is my body which will be given up for you. ... this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven."

The mutilation in this form, "for all men," is not the only problem : let us put it in the record. "St. Thomas, you know," writes one of our Dominican collaborators, "argues for the necessity of the pro multis clause on the grounds that it belongs to the integrity of the sentence spoken by Our Lord in consecrating His Blood, being a 'determination of the predicate.' But even apart from the substitution of 'for all men' in the form, this integrity is broken up by the period after 'This is the cup of my blood...' (continuing, 'It will be shed...'). I think, then, that even were the form otherwise translated correctly, this might be enough to invalidate it. At least a doubt would remain, for St. Thomas (at least in IV Sentences) says that Christ did not consecrate His Blood absolutely but insofar as it was (to be) shed on the cross. And this is brought out by the pro multis clause determining the predicate. We must, then, battle for the correction of this point too, arguing for a completely literal translation of the form, otherwise the last state may be as bad (though not worse) than the first."

Who authorized the ICEL to break up the wine consecration form into two sentences? No other vernacular version besides the English one has (to our knowledge) this additional bit of tampering with the form. Surely we agree with our Dominican friend that this must be fought also; and we mention this point now, just to put it into the record, though our present occupation is the "all men" battleground.

Change of Meaning

No one is challenging the truth of the wording in the ICEL "form": shed for all men so that sins may be forgiven. These words do express a certain doctrine, namely, that Christ died for all men : the universality of Redemption. But no one can deny that there is in this new "form" an inherent change of sense, or meaning. "For since in the sacraments," writes St. Thomas, "the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above, we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words : because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid."[34] And again: "Now it is clear if any substantial part of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed; and consequently the sacrament is invalid."[35]

Monsieur Paul Poitevin, of Paris, France, writes: "The ICEL translation 'shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven,' were they or not the very words pronounced by our Saviour, expresses happily a major Christian dogma..."[36]

Not caring that these words are not actually Our Lord's words is bad enough, but M. Poitevin apparently lacks any understanding whatsoever of sacramental theology. According to his line of reasoning, if one were to recite the Apostles' Creed as the form for Baptism this would baptize a person but good, in view of the fact that the Creed "expresses happily" not merely one, but many "major Christian dogmas."

What Is Wrong With "For All Men"?

Since 'all men' do not, never have, and never will belong to Christ's Mystical Body, it is evident that these words, substituted in the form, cannot possibly designate the res sacramenti.[37] On the contrary, they contain a false

signification; they are in opposition to the special grace of the Eucharist. "For all men" works against the purpose for which Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist, namely, the unity of His Mystical Body. As long as these words are present, mutilating the form, the Sacrament and the Mass must, in our opinion, be considered invalid, or at least very probably invalid.

Does the Holy Eucharist strengthen the bond of union (does such a bond exist?) among all men? Does the recipient of the Holy Eucharist solidify his spiritual union with all men? With the enemies of Christ? With those who hate and attack the Mystical Body? The Holy Eucharist that Christ gave us strengthens no such bond! It "has no effect," says St. Thomas, "except in those who are united with this sacrament through faith and charity. ... Hence in the Canon of the Mass no prayer is made for them who are outside the pale of the Church."[38] But now EVERYONE outside the paleof the Church gets a mention in the very consecration form!

Sacraments effect what they signify and signify what they effect. SO IF THE SIGNIFICATION IS DESTROYED, THE EFFECT IS ALSO DESTROYED. In that the words "for all men" destroy, nullify, and oppose the signification of the grace of the Sacrament, they also oppose the very grace itself of the Sacrament. These words, then, in effect, attack the unity of the Mystical Body. They deny the doctrine of the Mystical Body. What a mockery they make of the definition of Trent that the Holy Eucharist is "a symbol of that one body of which He is the Head and to which He wished us to be united as members by the closest bond of faith, hope and charity..." In Our Lord's discourse on His Mystical Body, His farewell address to His apostles, which He gave just after instituting this Most Holy Sacrament -- Judas Iscariot was absent, by the way, having already gone out to betray Him --, He said: "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me, because they are Thine."[39]

The solemn teaching of the Magisterium, given through the lips of the Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII : "THAT FORM CONSEQUENTLY CANNOT BE CONSIDERED APT OR SUFFICIENT FOR THE SACRAMENT WHICH OMITS WHAT IT OUGHT ESSENTIALLY TO SIGNIFY."[40] What then of a "form" which actually destroys what it must essentially signify?

--P.H.O.

INTERDVM is published occasionally. Subscription rate : $5 for eight consecutive issues. Foreign orders (Canada excepted) add $3 for air mail service; otherwise by surface mail.

In lieu of subscribing for 8 issues, one may order one issue at a time. For each copy desired send in a stamped (6¢) envelope addressed for mailing and 50¢ per copy; 3 copies of the same issue for $1.

Address all correspondence to: Patrick Henry Omlor, Box R, Menlo Park, California 94025.

EXTRA COPIES OF THIS ISSUE..One copy for 50¢; 3 for $1; 12 for $2; 25 for $3; 50 for $5; 100 for $10. These prices include postage and handling. All must go to the same address.

FOOTNOTES

1 Romans 10:17.

2 Issue of Dec. 18, 1969.

3 Theologia Moralis, Lib. VI, Tract. III, Cap. I, Dub.vi, par.221: "Invalida erit consecratio, si dicas: Hic (adverbialiter)est corpus meum."

4 Galatians 1:8.

5 Tract 80, In Joan, n.3.

6 Summa, III, Q.60, a.7. Emphasis added.

7 Bull Apostolicae Curae.

8 See also Summa, III, Q. 60, a.3, ad 2, : "Since a sacrament signifies that which sanctifies, it must needs signify the effect..."

9 Summa, III, Q.66, a.1.

10 Summa, III, Q.72, a.4, ad 3.

11 Summa, III, Q.72, a.6.

12 Summa, III, Q.72, a.5.

13 Summa, III, Q.72, a.2.

14 "Living With Christ", St. Mary's College Press, Winona, Minn., 1951, Course 2, p.78.

15 Part II, Ch. III, Q. 12.

16 Summa, III, Q.72, a.2, ad 2.

17 Trent Catechism, Part II, Ch. III, Q.8.

18 Summa, III, Q.72, a.2.

19 Trent Catechism, Part II, Ch. III, Q.9.

20 Summa, III, Q.72, a.9.

21 In I Cor. xi, lect. 6. Emphasis added.

22 M. de La Taille, The Mystery of Faith, II, p.40, n.2. (Thesis XXXV).

23 Cajetan, Tommaso (1469-1534), Dominican cardinal. Not to be confused with St. Cajetan, founder of the Theatines.

24 Summa, III, Q.73, a.3. Also in Q.83, a.4, ad 3: "The Eucharist is the Sacrament of the unity of the whole Church..."

25 Sess. XIII, ch.2 of the "Decree Concerning The Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist".

26 Summa, III, Q.74, a.1.

27 "Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'". Emphasis added.

28 See de La Taille, op. cit., Thesis XXXV.

29 Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, Canon 5 on the Holy Eucharist.

30 "The blood of your Lord, if you wish it, was given for you; if you do not wish it, it was not given for you....The blood of Christ is salvation to the willing, punishment to the unwilling." St. Augustine, Sermo 31. (Lesson 9, Nocturn III, July 1--Precious Blood.)

31 Died in 1787, a hundred years prior to Apostolicae Curae.

32 George D. Smith, "The Teaching of the Catholic Church", II, p.762.

33 Coun. Trent, sess.VII, Can. 1 on "The Sacraments in General." Also defined by Lyons II, and Florence.

34 Summa, III, Q.60, a.8.

35 Ibid.

36 Letter (Aug. 20, 1969) to Rev. Lawrence S. Brey.

37 That all living men are potentially members of the Mystical Body isn't ad rem. (Cf. Wanderer, 11/20/69). Flour and grapes are potentially valid matter.

38 Summa, III, Q.79, a.7.

39 John 17:9.

40 Bull Apostolicae Curae.